



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/922,431	08/03/2001	Gene E. Kirila II	13174.7USI1	7423
23552	7590	09/21/2004	EXAMINER	
MERCHANT & GOULD PC			KIM, PAUL L	
P.O. BOX 2903			ART UNIT	
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903			PAPER NUMBER	
			2857	

DATE MAILED: 09/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/922,431

Applicant(s)

KIRILA ET AL.

Examiner

Paul L Kim

Art Unit

2857

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply.

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 June 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hinrichs in view of Kenney et al.

With regard to claims 1, 4, 5, 9, 10, 13, 14, 18, 19, 22, 23, and 27-33, Hinrichs teaches a system for controlling a manufacturing process comprising: a sensor for measuring an operational parameter of the manufacturing process comprising a resin and reinforcement (fig. 4, part 50), a signal generator and transmitter (fig. 4 & col. 9, lines 43-48), a process controller (col. 9, lines 48-54), a process control software associated with the process controller wherein the software adjusts the operational parameters (col. 5, lines 34-40), and a transmitter for sending operational instructions from the remote location to the manufacturing locations where the remote site has the ability to change programming of the process controller on a real-time basis (col. 5, lines 40+).

Hinrichs, however, does not specify one or more manufacturing process being controlled remotely. Kenney et al teaches a real time process control system for a manufacturing process that controls the process of a plurality of manufacturing facilities remotely (col. 2, lines 12+ and col. 36, lines 28+). It would

Art Unit: 2857

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to modify Hinrichs, so that the process is controlled remotely, as taught by Kenney et al, in order to save costs by having just one process controller controlling a plurality of facilities.

With regard to claims 2, 3, 8, 11, 12, 20, 21, Hinrichs teaches a pressure in the manufacturing process being measured (col. 5, lines 5-7).

With regard to claims 6, 7, 15-17, and 24-26, Hinrichs teaches a temperature in the manufacturing process being measured (fig. 5, lines 1-4).

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed June 21, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. With regard to applicant's argument that the prior art does not teach the ability to change programming, claims in a pending application should be given their broadest reasonable interpretation (In re Pearson, 181 USPQ 641 (CCPA 1974)). Hinrichs et al discloses in column 5, lines 36-45 and 58+ that a computer program is used to control the curing process in real time according to sensed variables. It is inherent that the program variables would have to be modified in order to be able to control the processing equipment in accordance with sensed variables.

### ***Conclusion***

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2857

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul Kim whose telephone number is 571-272-2217. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursdays 10:00-6:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marc Hoff can be reached on 571-272-2216. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular communications and for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

Art Unit: 2857

PK

September 7, 2004

  
MARC S. HOFF  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800